

Date: Wed, 21 Apr 93 04:30:19 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #109
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Wed, 21 Apr 93 Volume 93 : Issue 109

Today's Topics:

10meters (Give it to CB)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 20 Apr 93 19:16:25 GMT
From: news!news.world.net!connected.com!beauty!rwing!fylz!ssc!markz@uunet.uu.net
Subject: 10meters (Give it to CB)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Jim Garver (zardo@ornews.intel.com) wrote:
: Somewhere I read that the frequencies between 25-30 Mhz were best for
: maximum ground wave propagation due to most bending of waves versus
: least atmospheric disturbance. The maximum reasonable size for a
: mobile 1/4 wave whip may also have something to do with it. I don't
: believe the effects of periodic skip conditions on 10-11 meters were
: properly understood or accounted for when the band was reallocated
: to CB class D.

The reason that CB got 27 MHz is that 27.120 +/- .163 MHz is an
Industrial/Scientific/Medical band, and the users of that service
are allowed to output unlimited amounts of crap.

It's also fairly cheap to build radios at that low a frequency.

Mark Zenier markz@ssc.wa.com markz@ssc.com

Date: Tue, 20 Apr 1993 22:53:58 GMT
From: swrinde!gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <930418.133623.7K4.rusnews.w165w@mooch.sbs.com>,
<1993Apr19.164322.23437@ke4zv.uucp>, <1993Apr20.183316.7088@leland.Stanford.EDU>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: Just waiting the OFs out

In article <1993Apr20.183316.7088@leland.Stanford.EDU> paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu
(Paul Flaherty) writes:

>In article <1993Apr19.164322.23437@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
writes:

>>In addition, an administration may take
>>exception to these requirements by filing such at a WARC. Japan
>>has done so, thus code free operators there may already use HF.
>

>Well, not quite. Ever wonder about those Kenwood "V" models -- you know, the
>ones with the 10W finals? Well, the reason those rigs exist is that the
>codeless license in Japan limits the output power on the HF bands to 10w.
>Somehow, I doubt that those proposing the elimination of the CW requirements
>would accept similar limitations...

They might, but then there's nothing that says they have to. Power limits
are a matter for national administrations, they're not set by international
treaty. Several nations have lower limits than ours for *all* their amateurs.
A few don't specify a limit at all. Just because the Japanese decided on
a 10 watt limit doesn't mean the US would do the same. Though they might
considering the current furor over violations of the minimum necessary
power rule. And if it were successful, as it likely would be, then the
FCC might decide to lower the power limit for *all* US amateurs to 10
watts at HF. That might be a good thing. It would certainly spur DSP
and ECC work.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #109
